

**REMARKS**

In the amendments above, Claims 11, 13, 15-24, and 26-28 have been newly cancelled and Claims 37 to 63 have been added. Support for new Claims 37 to 63 can be found, for example, as follows:

<b><u>CLAIM</u></b>	<b><u>SUPPORT</u></b>
37	Claim 11
38	Claim 15
39	Claim 16
40	Claims 17 and 26
41	Claim 18
42	Claim 19
43	Claim 20
44	Claim 21
45	Claim 22
46	Claim 23
47	Claim 24
48	Claim 27
49	Claim 28
50	Claims 11 and 13
51	Claims 11 and 13
52	Claim 15
53	Claim 16

54	Claims 17 and 26
55	Claim 18
56	Claim 19
57	Claim 20
58	Claim 21
59	Claim 22
60	Claim 23
61	Claim 24
62	Claim 27
63	Claim 28

Claims 11, 13, 15-24, and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner's attention is directed to the amendments above, wherein the newly presented claims are believed to overcome this rejection.

Claims 11, 15-24, and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fogarity et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,110,198 ("Fogarity"). Also, Claims 11, 15-24, and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,729,356 ("Baker I"), and Claims 11, 15-20, 27, and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elliot, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0236567 ("Elliot") in view of Baker et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0091439 ("Baker II") or Randall et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0158595 ("Randall"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The claims examined by the Examiner have been replaced by new Claims 37-62, which are intended to more readily distinguish Applicant's invention over the prior art. The Examiner's attention is particularly directed to independent Claims 37 and 50, which have been carefully crafted to distinguish over at least Fogarity and Baker I. Applicant's invention comprises a tubular standard vascular graft and separate docking heads that can be positioned on the outer surface of the graft. This basic premise is not taught or suggested by any of the references cited or any combination thereof.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 37 to 62 are patentable over the prior art and that the rejections under §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Should the claims be allowable but for minor matters that could be the subject of either an Examiner's Amendment or a supplemental submission by Applicant, Applicant would appreciate the Examiner's contacting Applicant's undersigned attorney.

As previously mentioned to the Examiner, Applicant welcomes an opportunity to conduct a personal interview with the Examiner to discuss Applicant's invention and the ways in which it differentiates over the prior art. Therefore, should the Examiner consider issuing another Office Action, Applicant would appreciate the Examiner's contacting Applicant's undersigned attorney to arrange a mutually convenient time to conduct such a personal interview.

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims herein are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/William H. Dippert/

---

William H. Dippert  
Reg. No. 26,723  
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: June 8, 2009

**Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC**

10 Bank Street

Suite No. 1061

White Plains, NY 10606

Phone: (914) 286-2813